APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,544	07/02/2001	Ponani Gopalakrishnan	YOR9-1998-0392US2	1137

			EXAMINER
46069	7590	11/10/2005	BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 WOODBURY ROAD
WOODBURY, NY 11797

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>20 October 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments are unpersuasive. Applicant argues that Ladd does not disclose or suggest a conversational browser or method for processing a CML document and rendering its conversational dialog in one or more of a plurality of user interface modalities. The examiner disagrees. Ladd teaches a network access apparatus of the system that allows the user to access (i.e., view and/or hear) the information retrieved from the information source wherein the network access apparatus may also include a voice or web browser (col. 3, lines 40-62). Ladd also teaches the markup language processed by the voice browser includes text, recorded source samples, navigational controls, and input controls to enable system designers or developers to create application programs for instructing the voice browser to provide a desired user interactive voice service by parsing the retrieved information (col. 15, lines 60 - col. 16, line 4; col. 16, lines 5-57). Therefore, Ladd teaches a method for processing a CML document (markup language document) and rendering its conversational dialog in one or more of a plurality of user interface modalities (via parsing the elements of the document to perform an audio or visual indication to the user). Applicant argues that it is unclear how accessing of information teaches or remotely suggests parsing and interpreting a CML file or application to render the conversational dialog. Ladd teaches the the information retrieved is a markup language document (col. 3, lines 6-22; col 5, lines 8-20; col. 11, lines 25-49) and that the mark-up language document and its elements when parsed and processed by the browser would instruct the voice browser to provide a desireed user interactive voice service (col. 15, line 60 - col. 16, line 4; col. 16, lines 5-57). Therefore, Ladd teaches the limitation as disclosed. Applicant acknowledges the fact that Ladd teaches a voice browser that can process a speech markup file to provide an interactive speech/voice application and discloses a markup language that enables development of an application for instructing the vocie browser to provide a desired user interactive voice service but that this does not suggest or disclose a CML that comprises meta-information implementing a conversational dialog to enable interaction with the user in a plurality of user interface modalities, much less a browser or methdo for parsing and interpreting a CML file or CML application to reder the conversational dialog in one or more of the plurality of user interface modalities. The examiner disagrees. As detailed above, Ladd teaches a browser having a parsing unit that interpretes the mark-up language document which contains various elements, to render a conversational dialog (play a sound / display a feature) in one or more of a plurality of user interface modalities. Therefore, Ladd teaches a CML (mark-up language) that comprises meta-information (elements) implementing a conversational dialog to enable interaction with the user in a plurality of user interface modalities (via parsing and processing the elements of the mark-up language document to play a sound or perform other processing) and thereby sufficiently meets the limitations and interpretations of the claims as disclosed .